Applicant: Oliver Goldman Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-596001 / P549

Serial No.: 10/656,593
Filed: September 4, 2003

Page : 16 of 18

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 18, 20-39 and 43-62 were pending as of the action mailed on September 6, 2007. Claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49 are in independent form. Claims 1, 8, 18, 20, 26, 33, 43, 49, and 56 have been amended.

Claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion to incorporate the language of claims 7, 32, and 55 into each independent claim. Additionally, claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion to include steps supported by the applicant's FIG. 3.

Claims 8, 33, and 56 have been amended to correct claim dependencies. Claims 7, 32, and 55 have been cancelled. No claims have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the action are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

# **Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks examiner Techane Gergiso for granting a telephone interview on November 8, 2007. The time spent with the applicant's representative Arriènne M. Lezak, was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. The examiner indicated that independent claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49 would be allowable if they included the claim language from dependent claims 7, 32, and 55. These recommendations have been incorporated into the remaining claims as noted above.

### **Section 112 Rejections**

Claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete. To expedite prosecution, and without conceding that these amendments are essential steps, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 26 in accordance with the examiner's suggestions.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant: Oliver Goldman Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-596001 / P549

Serial No.: 10/656,593

: September 4, 2003

Page : 17 of 18

Filed

## Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-14, 18, 20-39, and 43-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0157006 ("Narishima") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,152,158 ("Watanabe").

Claims 14, 39, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narishima and Watanabe in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0129256 ("Parmelee").

Claims 22-25 and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narishima and Watanabe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,382 ("Kinnis").

### Claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49

Claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion to incorporate the language of claims 7, 32, and 55 into each independent claim.

## Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 20, 26, 43 and 49 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-10, 32-35, and 55-58 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, and in accordance with the examiner's suggestion, the claim language from dependent claims 7, 32, and 55 has been incorporated into independent claims 1, 18, 20, 26, 43 and 49.

Applicant: Oliver Goldman Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-596001 / P549

Serial No.: 10/656,593

Filed: September 4, 2003

Page : 18 of 18

#### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2007 /Arriènne M. Lezak/

Arriènne M. Lezak Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 21876 Fish & Richardson P.C. Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50437590.doc